DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 184 956 **SO 012 493**

AUTHOR Diem, Richard A.
TITLE Curricular and Programmatic Patterns in Social Studies Developed under Title IV C.
PUB DATE 8 Apr 80
NOTE 16p.; Paper presented to the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Boston, MA, April 8, 1980).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Educational Needs; Educational Research; Elementary Secondary Education; *Federal Aid; *Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; *Social Studies; Validated Programs

ABSTRACT

A study to determine the nature, effectiveness, and level of funding of social studies programs funded under Title IV, Part C of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, is reported. Part C provides funding for innovative programs and projects that adopt the validated programs of other cost effective educational projects. Questionnaires were sent to state social studies specialists requesting information on the nature of social studies programs, the location of these activities, and the level of monetary support. Projects reported include citizenship, consumer, environmental, law, and multi-ethnic education; social studies and reading; global education; racial awareness; and oral history. Findings indicate that few projects directly involved students; evaluation components revealed little direct student performance measures; and implementation strategies involved little teacher input. Also, although curriculum materials developed under this act have proven to be important supplements to texts, most material is difficult to obtain. The variety of programs reflects the areas of most concern to both state and local educators. Finally, the average percent of Title IV monies spent on social studies is 5.9 of total available funds. The conclusion is that since social studies is currently not among the high priority funding items of Title IV C, it may have to ally itself with other curriculum areas and look for other sources of funding. (KC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

APR 25 1980

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Richard A. Diem

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED184956

CURRICULAR AND PROGRAMMATIC PATTERNS IN SOCIAL STUDIES DEVELOPED UNDER TITLE IV C

Richard A. Diem
The University of Texas at San Antonio

A Paper Presented to the Annual Meeting
of the
American Educational Research Association

April 8, 1980
Boston, Massachusetts

SO 012 493

Curricular and Programmatic Patterns in Social Studies
Developed Under Title IV C

The purposes of this study were to determine: (1) the types of social studies programs being funded and developed under Title IV C; (2) the nature of those funded programs; that is, what type of methodologies were being employed in the various projects, what types of populations were being affected by these projects, and what kinds of curricular materials were being developed under these projects, (3) the level of funding for social studies projects as compared to other areas of the curriculum, and (4) implications of these findings in determining curricular decisions for social studies education in the next ten years.

Title IV C

Public Law 93-380 of the education amendments of 1974, created Title IV of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Under part C of this act innovative projects designed to develop new and creative approaches to education and projects that adopt the validated programs and practices of other cost effective educational projects, can be provided funds for development. State education agencies, educational service centers, and local education agencies are the only groups that are allowed to compete for these funds.

The monies for this Title are appropriated by the federal government to the states on a per pupil allotment from 85% of the total amount of the program. A minimum of 15% of all available funds are allocated to programs for the handicapped. Local education agencies may also apply for discretionary funds to strengthen their agencies. The money available for this program is usually 15% of available IV C funds.

The types of projects and priorities for the granting of funds are set by individual state advisory councils. These councils work with the state education agencies on the development of criteria for the distribution of the allocated dollars and the criteria for approval of the projects. These councils are appointed by the various state governors. Length of service on these commissions varies from state to state.

Although projects and priorities differ from state to state and change on a yearly basis, the kinds of projects that are funded generally fall into the following categories:

1. Planning or Developmental Projects - these projects develop ideas, practices, techniques, or processes which are new to a state, a geographic area or a district within a state, the results of which will meet a priority educational need of students in the state.
2. Adopter Projects - these grants select and replicate exemplary programs developed by other agencies which can also serve priority educational needs of students in the applicant agency.
3. Disseminator Projects - these activities provide information, materials, and training as an aid to other local education agencies desiring to adopt an exemplary approach to the solution of an educational problem common to all or several local education agencies that has been successfully developed by applicant agency.
4. Facilitator Projects - these programs assist local education agencies, in cooperation with the state and other local agencies within a state, in lcoating appropriate exemplary programs to meet the educational needs of students.

In the original ESEA Act, funding priorities were established by the federal government and revolved around subject areas. That is, specific disciplines such as social studies, were allocated amounts directly and competitive grant awards were then offered to states and local education agencies. When the law changed and the states began to control monetary allocations directly, the types of project areas that were fundable became more broadly based. Most states began to use IV C as a means of establishing experimental inservice projects. Once this occurred generic disciplines suffered as state councils sought projects that would affect curriculum and inservice on a broad basis rather than concentrating on single subject areas. Some states, such as Ohio, still fund single subject/curriculum projects but this approach has been largely eliminated.

Social Studies and IV C

To find out the kinds of recent social studies projects funded under Title IV C, a questionnaire asking: the nature of any social studies programs, the location of these activities, and the level of monetary support for them. was sent to state agency social studies specialists. Self-addressed return envelopes were enclosed for replies. Two followup letters, one sent after six weeks and another after twelve weeks, followed the original query in an attempt to solicit as many replies as possible. The names of these persons were obtained from the 1977-78 CS4 (Council of State Social Studies) Directory. Survey forms were sent to representatives from all 50 states and the Canal Zone. Replies, in one form or another, were received from 34 states and the Canal Zone.[2]

The level of responses varied. In most instances all information requested was supplied. Some states, such as Florida and Texas, for example, would not release funding levels for individual projects. In other instances, like Hawaii and Virginia, levels of monetary support for projects were listed in terms of 3 to 5 year brackets. Despite the disparate variety of responses to this survey, a picture of the kinds of social studies projects being supported by Title IV C emerged.

Types of Social Studies Projects

Since each state sets divergent priorities for funding projects, a variance of activities from state to state seemed likely to occur. In examining the kinds of funded social studies projects these expected differences were not as great as expected.

All of the reported projects, with a social studies component, were enfused with either curriculum development or staff development activities. A major exception to this were in states, notably Texas and Vermont, where programs involving the development of basic competency testing of students in the areas of social studies, or citizenship education, as a project segment were also given monies.

Programs that included a social studies could be classified as following:[3]

1. Citizenship Education - activities and projects within this area vary as to the individual needs of each state. For example, North Carolina funded a project showing the effects of decision making and how to teach these skills as part of the citizenship education process, while in Wisconsin a local school district is writing a citizen participation curriculum that will develop student competencies necessary to participate as an effective citizen.

2. Consumer Education - included in this area are the development of local curriculum packages in consumer education (Delaware), staff training in consumer education materials (Florida), economics and consumer education materials (Michigan), and career education (West Virginia).

3. Environmental Education - several states (Maryland, Texas, and Virginia), have priorities and programs in this area. Although these projects have social studies components as part of their activities, they also involve some of the physical and natural sciences in carrying out their activities. Social Studies components are structured around value and attitude development in this area.

4. Law Education - activities in this area are sometimes co-funded under the Law Enforcement Assistance Act and from various state bar associations. The types of programs involve staff and program development training (Oklahoma), legal education for local school district (Vermont), and development of materials in crime prevention (Virginia).

5. Multi-Ethnic/Multi-Heritage Education - even though every state, since 1975, has had a project from the federally funded Ethnic Heritage Program within its border, there are also Title IV C projects in this area. Most notable is the Hawaii Multi-Cultural Awareness Project that was funded for $800,000 between 1975-78. Other states, such as Maine, have begun state study projects that emphasize the variety of peoples and their origins within a particular state.

6. Social Studies and Reading - projects in this area involve developing reading skill competencies for teachers in content areas (Idaho and Connecticut); staff development in reading for content teachers (Texas), training teachers in finding the readability levels of their textbooks (Arizona) and using social studies materials as part of a basic skills program (Colorado).

7. Other Areas - other topics involving social studies skills that have been funded under a Title IV C project are global education, map and globe skill development, economic education, racial awareness, oral history, individualized social studies programs and family history projects.

An example of some representative projects that fell within these broad categories include:

State	Location of Project	Project
Connecticut	Suffield, Conn.	Development of local History resources
Delaware	Statewide	Curricular Consumer Education Modules
Hawaii	Honolulu, Hawaii	Curriculum and staff development in Multicultural Awareness
Florida	Dade County, Florida	Curriculum and Staff Development in Law Education
Idaho	Idaho Falls, Idaho	Reading in the content areas
Illinois	Lake Park H.S. Roselle, Illinois	As individualized Social Studies Program
Maryland	Statewide	Staff and Curriculum Development in Elementary Law Education
Michigan	Farmington, Michigan	Merging Everyone's Resources for Global Education (MERGE)
Nebraska	Ord, Nebraska	Curriculum Development in Areas of Nebraska State, County and Local Government
Ohio	Cleveland, Ohio	Preservation of African Culture and History Through Art
Texas	Harlandale Ind. School Dist., San Antonio, TX	Staff development in Reading and Social Studies

State	Location of Project	Project
Virginia	Orange County, Virginia	Curriculum and Staff Development in Environmental Education
West Virginia	Marlinton, West Virginia	Future Studies
Wisconsin	Madison, Wisconsin	Development of student competencies to participate as an effective citizen

There were few projects that directly involved students. Most activities centered around either inservice teacher training or curriculum development.

Examination of the evaluation components of IV C projects revealed little in the way of direct student performance measures. A project was usually considered effective if participants completed workshops, assigned tasks, on particular curricular activities. This is a real weakness in this entitlement as it is doubtful if a project could succeed unless student performance increased. Few of these funded activities included either experimental designs, random subject selection, or any type of extensive evaluation other than cursory visits by state agency personnel and an end of the year report.

Yet another weakness in most of these projects was their implementation strategies. Most did not follow the patterns for successful inservice projects that have been noted in the 1977 Rand Study (McLaughlin and Berman, 1977). Most of these projects were directed downward from administrators and grant developers to classroom teachers. Little input in the way of planning objectives or activities by individual teachers was noted. It is difficult to imagine projects succeeding, over a long time period, with this lack of direct teacher input.

The curriculum materials developed under this act have proven to be important supplements to texts available to state and local education agencies. The one criticism in this area is a lack of central clearhouses for these items at either the state or federal level. Most of this material is distributed by a word of mouth basis and is difficult to obtain unless one knows of a specific project in a specific locale.

The wide variety of programs that included a social studies component also drew two types of conclusions: (1) What is important in Social Studies depends on where one lives and who has defined what it will be composed of. Looking at the types of funded activities one finds that they range from an emphasis on citizenship education models of social education to ones that tie social studies to basic skills, like reading. This may lead to a redefining of social studies and eventually could include it as part of a basic skill development process; (2) since each state defines its own priorities, developmental programs reflect the areas that are of most concern to both state and local educators. Interestingly these concerns, especially in the area of citizenship, consumer education, and reading, realte to all areas that the National Assessment of Educational Progress (1977) showed as major weaknesses for many students.

The emphasis in these areas seems to indicate a direct concern for overcoming current student deficits. Few of these projects are projective in nature. That is, except for some activities on future studies and the use of computer management systems, no emphasis is placed on what could, or should, be happening in the social studies ten or even five years hence. If these projects are to reflect new ideas in social studies, this would indicate serious flaws in this program.

Levels of Funding for Social Studies Projects

The allocation of monies for Title IV C activities related directly to project priorities set by each state. Put simply, if an educational area was not ranked highly it was not funded. Although some conclusions about funding levels may be inferred by examining individual state project listings, a collated set of cumulative materials on subject areas of Title IV C projects or a list of all state priorities for the IV C program that would provide an overview of the program since its inception might show the direction it is heading and where it has been. This would be of immense help to educational planners, at all levels. Unfortunately, this material does not presently exist.[4] Neither the Department of Health, Education and Welfare nor the various state agencies collect this type of comparative information. An examination of several states' IV C allotments and the monies spent on social studies projects, can provide some insight into the status of social studies in relation to the educational needs of these locales.

Of the eleven states listed in the accompanying chart, the average percent of Title IV C monies spent on social studies is 5.9 of the total available funds. This figure is somewhat inflated due to the fact that the revenues reported for Virginia are based on an average of three to five years funding, but is indicative of the monetary level that social studies projects are supported with throughout the nation.

Given this data, one can infer that social studies is not currently among the high priority funding items of most IV C programs. If a social studies project is funded, it usually must be part of a broader program such as reading, individualizing instruction, or staff development.

In examining IV C programs from throughout the nation few of the funded social studies programs were strictly generic in nature. Most of the programs were shared with other academic subject areas or skill development programs.

This leads to the inescapable conclusion that social studies may have to ally itself with other areas of the curriculum such as language arts, science, or reading. In an age when developmental monies from government are increasingly small, and more difficult to obtain, this strategy might help in gaining funding but it may also lead to a downgrading of the teaching and researching of various aspects of the social studies.

It is also imperative that this one program not be relied upon as the major stimulus for program and curriculum development in social studies. Other programs, at both federal and state levels, are available for social studies project funding and need to be utilized.

An example of these are the social studies programs being developed as part of the Women's Educational Equity Act (WEEA). The WEEA authorizes the support of activities that include the development, evaluation and dissemination of curriculum, textbooks, and other educational materials. Several social studies curriculum projects such as the "Social Studies/ Sex Fair Materials" and "History Contributions of Hispanic Women" are being written with financial assistance of this act. The focus of these projects emphasize historical and developmental role models for women. Materials, in the form of curriculum guides, workbooks, and lists of supplementary sources will be developed to pursue these goals.

In the same context both the office of Consumers Education and National Endowment for the Humanities offer aid in developing curriculum and programmatic activities. The projects in consumer education vary from a computerized consumer education center to a program in deaf consumer education. Funded projects by NEH vary widely from single subject curricular development to regional grants that seek renovation of entire humanities curriculums within school districts.

While all of these programs, and others in various cabinet departments, provide a stimulus for furthering social studies curriculum and staff development, the best resource available for social studies educators, at both the state and local school district level that funds social studies projects in a consistent manner is Title IV C, ESEA; for these funds are specifically set aside for specific programs and staff development. If social studies projects are to be included among those that are funded, a better effort at lobbying for social studies priorities must be done. A concentrated effort must be made to lobby the various state advisory councils so that they include new opportunities for social studies projects. Many of these should be experimental, involve technology, and include strong emphasis on both process formative and product formative evaluation. If changes such as these are put in place, the social studies curriculum can be strengthened.

NOTES

1. These priority listings were taken from the Texas Education Title IV C Guidelines 1978-79.
2. States not responding were: Alabama, Alaska, Arkansas, Georgia, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Montana, New Hampshire, New Mexico, New York, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Wyoming.
3. These categories are not listed by number of programs in each nor by state priority. They are merely alphabetized..
4. In a letter, dated May 19, 1978, Mr. David G. Phillips, Division of State Educational Assistance Programs, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, related that this type of information had not been collected.
5. The states listed in this chart are representative of other states in their regions of the country. It should also be noted that several states did not respond to subject priority breakdown that the author requested. Hence, this information was unavailable for inclusion in this article.
6. For more information regarding the types of proposals, deadlines for acceptance, and general guidelines for Title IV C projects, contact the various state departments of education. Generally, guidelines appear in mid-fall (October-December) of each year. Most programs are funded for one to three years. Levels and amounts of monies for grants vary from state to state.

REFERENCE

Paul Berman and Milbry McLaughlin, Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, Vol. VIII: Implementing and Sustaining Innovations (Santa Monica, California: Rand, May, 1978), R-1589/9-HEW

FIGURE 1

Example of Funding Levels for Title IV C Social Studies Projects
1978-79 Fiscal Year

State	Total IV C Funds Available	*Funds Spent on Social Studies Projects	Percent of Total	Number of Projects
Colorado	2,164,812	17,000	.7%	1
Connecticut	2,607,047	148,000	5.6%	4
Maine	1,260,105	140,000	11.0%	1
Missouri	3,912,354	107,243	2.0%	2
Nebraska	1,551,741	3,000	.2%	2
North Carolina	4,561,441	176,000	3.8%	2
Ohio	9,201,343	47,859	.5%	30
Oregon	1,918,024	122,530	6.3%	2
Rhode Island	1,190,463	65,000	5.4%	2
Virginia	4,194,101	1,124,000**	26.7%	6
Wisconsin	4,079,975	110,551	2.7%	3

*These are projects identified by state social studies specialists.

**The dollar figures reported are an average of 3-5 year funding.